

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

201 REDWOOD SHORES PARKWAY
REDWOOD SHORES, CA 94065

RECEIVED

DEC 18 2006

Copyright Royalty Board

KENNETH L. STEINTHAL
DIRECT LINE (650) 802-3081
kenneth.steintal@weil.com

December 18, 2006

AUSTIN
BOSTON
BRUSSELS
BUDAPEST
DALLAS
FRANKFURT
HOUSTON
LONDON
MIAMI
MUNICH
NEW YORK
PARIS
PRAGUE
RHODE ISLAND
SHANGHAI
SINGAPORE
WARSAW
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Copyright Royalty Board
Library of Congress
U.S. Copyright Office
101 Independence Ave., S.E.
Washington, DC 20559-6000

Re: Docket No. 2005-1 CRB DTRA

Dear Judges Sledge, Roberts, and Wisniewski:

Attached please find a table of contents for the Reply of the Digital Media Association and Its Member Companies to SoundExchange's Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, which was filed on Friday. We inadvertently omitted the table of contents, and submit it now for your convenience.

Respectfully submitted,


Kenneth L. Steinthal

cc: All Counsel

REPLY OF THE DIGITAL MEDIA ASSOCIATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| PRELIMINARY STATEMENT | 2 |
| REPLY TO SOUNDEXCHANGE’S PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW | 4 |
| I. STARE DECISIS..... | 4 |
| II. THE STATUTORY STANDARD: THE HYPOTHETICAL COMPETITIVE MARKET | 4 |
| III. STARE DECISIS AND THE MUSICAL WORKS MODEL..... | 13 |
| IV. OTHER LEGAL ISSUES..... | 15 |
| 1. Gross Revenue Definition..... | 15 |
| REPLY TO SOUNDEXCHANGE’S PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT..... | 17 |
| I-IV. REPLY TO SOUNDEXCHANGE’S PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT SECTIONS I-IV..... | 17 |
| V. THE BENCHMARKS | 17 |
| B. Musical Works – Dr. Jaffe’s Benchmark..... | 17 |
| VI. THE DIVISION OF THE AVAILABLE SURPLUS BETWEEN SOUND RECORDING OWNERS AND USERS OF THOSE SOUND RECORDINGS | 19 |
| VII. IMPROVEMENTS IN THE MARKET SINCE 2002 | 19 |
| A. SoundExchange’s Projections of Growth Do Not Justify a Higher Royalty Rate..... | 19 |
| B. SoundExchange’s Projections of Revenue Growth Fail to Account For Corresponding Costs | 20 |
| 1. Webcaster Revenues Are In Fact Dwarfed By Related Costs..... | 20 |
| 2. SoundExchanges’s Use of Future Revenues to Justify an Increase in the Royalty Rate is Circular and Ignores the Role of the Royalty Rate in Determining Future Growth..... | 24 |
| 3. SoundExchange’s Advertising Growth Figures Fail to Account For Commissions Paid to Ad Rep Firms..... | 26 |
| C. SoundExchange’s Projections of Growth Are Frequently Misleading..... | 27 |
| D. SoundExchange Misleadingly Presents Evidence Dealing with Non-Webcasting Services and Revenues as Relating to Webcasting..... | 28 |

**REPLY OF THE DIGITAL MEDIA ASSOCIATION
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| E. Webcasters Do Not Use Nonsubscription Products As “Loss-Leaders” for More Lucrative Businesses | 31 |
| F. DiMA Member Testimony Makes Clear That Video Pre-roll or “Gateway” Advertising Is a Pipe Dream/Webcasters not Leaving Ad Revenue on the Table..... | 33 |
| G. SoundExchange Has Adduced No Evidence of Ad Targeting | 35 |
| H. Miscellaneous | 35 |
| VIII. WIRELESS AND PORTABILITY | 37 |
| B. SoundExchange Mischaracterizes the Fundamental Distinctions Regarding Portability | 37 |
| C. SoundExchange Members Do Not Assume Any Additional Risks or Costs that Would Justify a Premium Rate For Webcasting Delivered via the Internet Over Wireless Networks | 42 |
| IX. PROMOTION AND SUBSTITUTION | 43 |
| A. SoundExchange Misinterprets the Applicable Statutory Criteria..... | 43 |
| B. Webcasting is Inherently Promotional..... | 44 |
| B. Webcasting Does Not Substitute for CD Sales..... | 47 |
| 1. There is No Evidence to Support SoundExchange’s Narrowcasting Theory | 47 |
| 2. There is No Evidence to Suggest that the Availability of Streamripping Software Displaces Music Sales | 49 |
| X. THE ROLES OF THE RECORD COMPANIES AND RECORDING ARTISTS IN THE CREATION OF THE COPYRIGHTED WORK..... | 51 |
| XI. EPHEMERAL COPIES..... | 54 |